Plaintiff Twana Ahmed Will Call:

witness	brief statement of the subject matter and substance of their testimony	deposed and type	sworn @ trial	testified @ trial
	defendant's current or former employees			
Twana Ahmed 9919 Richmond Avenue, Apt. 1122 Houston, TX 77042 (832) 896-9276	Plaintiff. How defendant treated him as an employee and his damages.	deposed fact witness		
Katherine Alyea Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (713) 321-0086	Defendant's Senior Regional HR Manager. Defendant's HR systems, policies, and procedures. Her assignment of Defendant's HR Representative Wayne Oliver to speak with Twana Ahmed regarding Mr. Ahmed's discrimination report.	deposed fact witness		
Catherine Barnes Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (832) 786-3911	Defendant's HR Coordinator. Defendant's HR systems, policies, and procedures. Receipt and process of handling Twana Ahmed's report of discrimination.	not deposed fact witness		
Alexander Bergeron Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060	Defendant's Field Supervisor. One of defendant's employees who supervised Twana Ahmed. Knowledge of Twana Ahmed's work and qualifications, defendant's policies and procedures, and events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	Not deposed fact witness		

Patrick Freeney Last known home: 17011 Colt Creek Court Humble, TX 77346 (762) 524-1023	Defendant's Client Manager. One of defendant's employees who supervised Twana Ahmed. Knowledge of how defendant treated Twana Ahmed, defendant's policies and procedures, and events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	
Wayne Oliver Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (713) 321-0086	Defendant's Regional HR Representative. Knowledge concerning investigation into Twana Ahmed's reports of discrimination after Mr. Ahmed's termination, defendant's HR systems, policies and procedures.	not deposed fact witness	
Mauro Andres Siboldi Last known home: 4634 Hawk Meadow Dr. Katy, TX 77449 (346) 316-0299	Defendant's former Security Officer. Knowledge concerning discrimination at defendant, the training that security officers went through, and the work environment.	not deposed fact witness	
Mauricio Zepeda Last known home: 11300 Regency Green Dr., Apt. 1307 Cypress, TX 77429 (832) 580-2829	Defendant's Site Supervisor. Knowledge concerning his supervision of Twana Ahmed for defendant, defendant refusing to accommodate Mr. Ahmed's religion concerning Mr. Ahmed's beard, Mr. Ahmed's work and qualifications, defendant's policies and procedures, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	
	harm defendant caused to Twana Ahmed		
Manaure Bethencourt 7500 Emmett F. Lowry Express La Marque, TX 77591 (409) 354-8531	Friend of Twana Ahmed. Knowledge of how defendant harmed Twana Ahmed.	not deposed fact witness	

		defendant			
Universal Protection Service, LP d/b/a Allied Universal 450 Exchange Irvine, CA 92602-5002		30(b)(6) representative.	ents surrounding Mr. Ahmed's ne stenographic and/or audio and	deposed fact witness	
	page 5 lines 13-23 page 6 lines 15-23 page 7 lines 11-17 page 8 lines 6-9, 15-25 page 9 lines 1-13 page 12 lines 22-25 page 13 lines 1-6 page 21 lines 4-7, 8-14 page 22 lines 21-25 page 23 lines 1-2, 5 page 27 lines 7-25 page 28 lines 1-7 page 36 lines 10-25 page 45 lines 8-11, 22-25 page 46 lines 1-3, 8 page 55 lines 17-25	page 59 lines 1, 13-25 page 60 lines 1-15 page 62 lines 16-25 page 63 lines 1-14 page 64 lines 1-13, 21-25 page 65 lines 1-7 page 70 lines 18-21, 22-25 page 71 lines 1-4, 5-8, 9-10, 12-19 page 72 lines 9-24 page 75 lines 11-12, 17-25 page 76 lines 1-5 page 78 lines 4-6 page 79 lines 4-8, 9-15 page 80 line 25 page 81 lines 1-5, 22-25 page 82 lines 1-25	page 89 lines 5-25 page 90 lines 1-18 page 93 lines 18-25 page 94 lines 1-25 page 95 lines 1-25 page 96 lines 1-21 page 98 lines 11-17, 21-25 page 99 lines 1-4 page 113 lines 23-25 page 114 line 1 page 115 11-13, 16-25 page 116 lines 1-7, 11-13, 14-16, 19-21, 22-23 page 117 lines 1-4, 7-12, 22-25 page 118 lines 1-5, 6-9, 14-15 page 120 lines 1-15, 16-25 page 121 lines 1-14, 15-22		
	page 56 lines 1-5, 12-25 page 57 lines 1-6 page 58 lines 3-7, 20-25 these excerpts, highlighted,	page 83 lines 1-10 page 85 lines 9-12, 14-25 page 86 line 1, 2-23 are attached to this witness list.	page 122 line 25 page 123 lines 1-4, 9-10, 17-20 page 124 lines 2-6		

Plaintiff Twana Ahmed May Call:

witness	brief statement of the subject matter and substance of their testimony	deposed and type	sworn @ trial	testified @ trial
	defendant's current or former employees			
Krystal Balanta Last known work: Allied Universal 1717 Turning Basin Dr., Suite 235 Houston, TX 77029 (281) 908-0665	Defendant's Recruiter. Knowledge of defendant making Twana Ahmed ineligible for re-hire, and events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness		
Matthew Gaussen Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060	Defendant's Director of Operations. Knowledge concerning defendant's policies and procedures, the investigation into Twana Ahmed's reports of discrimination and retaliation, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness		
Martin Hernandez Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060	Defendant's Trainer. Knowledge concerning how defendant treated Twana Ahmed in onboarding / training as an employee of defendant, and the company policies and procedures applied to Mr. Ahmed.	not deposed fact witness		
Nathan Hernandez Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (281) 219-7191	Defendant's Field Supervisor. Supervised Twana Ahmed for Defendant. Knowledge concerning Mr. Ahmed's work and qualifications, defendant's policies and procedures, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness		

Chelsea Joseph 3802 Simsbrook Drive Houston, TX 77045 (832) 517-2371	Defendant's former employee. Knowledge concerning discrimination and retaliation at defendant, the training that security officers went through, and the work environment.	not deposed fact witness	
Bill King Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (346) 802-8305	Defendant's Regional Vice President. Knowledge concerning defendant's training, policies and procedures, generally and as applied to Twana Ahmed, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	
Don Massey Last known work: Allied Universal 1776 Woodstead Court, Suite 224 The Woodlands, TX 77380 (281) 725-8623	Defendant's former General Manager. Knowledge concerning Twana Ahmed's training with defendant, defendant's policies and procedures, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	
Monroe McClain Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (281) 881-4473	Defendant's Regional Trainer. Knowledge concerning training of Twana Ahmed, Mr. Ahmed's work and qualifications, and defendant's policies and procedures.	not deposed fact witness	
Kareem McKinnon Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (832) 687-9248	Defendant's former Regional Vice President and current Senior Vice President. Knowledge concerning defendant's policies and procedures, the investigation into Twana Ahmed's reports of discrimination and retaliation, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	

Patrick Parham Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 North Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060	Defendant's Field Supervisor. Knowledge of his supervision of Twana Ahmed, Mr. Ahmed's work and qualifications, dedfendant's policies and procedures, and the events surrounding Mr. Ahmed's suspension and termination.	not deposed fact witness	
Raymond Rodriguez Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060 (832) 441-2052 Last known home address [see ECF 34-1, p. 151]: 16402 Ashlyn Timbers Lane Magnolia, TX 77355 (832) 513-0699	Defendant's former Security Officer and current Field Supervisor. Knowledge concerning the training that security officers went through with defendant, defendant's use of force policies, and the working environment.	not deposed fact witness	
Dwayne Trahan Last known work: Allied Universal 11811 N. Freeway, Suite 810 Houston, TX 77060	Defendant's former Client Manager. Knowledge concerning the training that defendant's security officers went through, use of force policies, defendant's process of hiring Twana Ahmed, and the working environment.	not deposed fact witness	

	defendant's client		
Meredith Rodriques Last known work: H-E-B 5895 San Felipe St. Houston, TX 77057 (713) 278-8450	H-E-B Manager in Charge. Knowledge of H-E-B's security agreements with defendant, of Twana Ahmed's work, and report of man attempting theft / request for Twana Ahmed to stop the attempted theft at H-E-B store Ms. Rodrigues was managing.	not deposed fact witness	
	witness to security officer mistreatment		
Kamesha Sterling Last known work: 5603 Fair Forest Dr. Houston, TX 77088 (832) 526-0047	Patron of a grocery store at which defendant contracted to provide security. Knowledge of defendant's security officer mistreatment of patron at store, video she took of a defendant security officer at a Kroger on more than one occasion.	not deposed fact witness	

Plaintiff Twana Ahmed may also call any witness listed on Defendant's witness list.

1	for Universal Protection Service, LP, doing
2	business as Allied Universal Security Services.
3	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you,
4	Counsel.
5	Would the reporter please swear in
6	the witness.
7	ANNA SOJA, PMK, a witness
8	herein, having been first duly sworn, was
9	examined and testified as follows:
10	EXAMINATION
11	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
12	Q. Thank you.
13	Do you agree that companies must
14	protect employees from discrimination in the
15	workplace?
16	A. Yes, I do.
17	Q. Is that important?
18	A. Yes, it is.
19	Q. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 is not
20	important at all, and 10 is the most important,
21	how important is it that companies protect
22	employees from discrimination in the workplace?
23	A. 10.
24	Q. Why is that important?
25	A. It is important for us to be able to

JOB NO. 1171182

protect our employees from any discrimination 1 2 based on any race, religion, national origin, 3 or any protected classes as stated by the law. 4 Is there any other reason why it's Ο. 5 important besides the law? 6 It is good for us to foster a Α. Yes. safe and comfortable environment for all of our 7 employees, to foster an inclusive and diverse 8 9 environment for our employees. 10 So it is very important for us to be 11 able to have an environment where individuals 12 are able to come into work, feel comfortable 13 when they're in the work environment and the 14 individuals they are working with. 15 0. Do you agree that companies must 16 protect employees from retaliation when they 17 report discrimination? 18 Yes, I do. Α. 19 Is that important? 0. 20 Α. Yes, it is. 21 On the same scale of 1 to 10, how 0. 2.2 would you rate that? 23 Α. 10. 24 0. And why is it important to protect 25 employees from retaliation?

1	A. It is important for us to protect
2	employees from retaliation in order for them to
3	feel comfortable in the environment they are
4	working with and to protect them from any
5	lawful behaviors conducted by other
6	individuals.
7	And to make sure that they have an
8	environment that they could work in where they
9	don't fear that they will be retaliated against
10	if they brought any matters to our attention.
11	Q. Do you agree that companies must
12	protect employees from retaliation when they
13	request religious accommodations?
14	A. Yes, I do.
15	Q. And on the same scale of 1 to 10,
16	how important is that?
17	A. 10.
18	Q. And why is that important?
19	A. It is important for us for our
20	companies or Allied Universal to ensure
21	that an individual is able to bring to our
22	attention a reasonable accommodation request
23	and for us to review the accommodation request
24	and be able to provide them with an interactive
25	conversation to protect their rights and for us

[
1	to be able to review all the information that
2	was provided to us to ensure that we are
3	protecting their rights and reviewing the
4	information they brought to us in regards to
5	any accommodations.
6	Q. Do you agree that not protecting
7	employees from discrimination or retaliation
8	can be unsafe?
9	A. I do.
10	Q. Is it fine with you if I refer to
11	"Allied Universal" or "Universal Protection
12	Services, LP," as just "Allied"?
13	A. Yes. Yeah.
14	Q. Thank you.
15	Are Allied's policies and procedures
16	mandatory?
17	A. Yes, they are.
18	Q. Allied has a zero-tolerance policy
19	for discrimination and harassment; correct?
20	A. Yes, they do.
21	Q. And Allied also has a zero-tolerance
22	policy for retaliation in the work place?
23	A. That is correct, yes.
24	Q. On a scale of 1 to 10, 1 being not
25	important at all and 10 being the most

1	important, how important is it to Allied that
2	it follow its policies and procedures?
3	A. 10.
4	Q. Okay. And on the same scale of 1 to
5	10, how important is it to Allied that there be
6	no discrimination in the workplace?
7	A. 10.
8	Q. And same scale, that there be no
9	retaliation in the workplace?
10	A. 10.
11	Q. And same scale, that there be no
12	harassment in the workplace?
13	A. 10.
14	Q. How does Allied ensure that there is
15	no discrimination in the workplace?
16	A. Well, Allied does provide several
17	trainings for all individuals for from every
18	level, from a security professional to senior
19	management, to ensure that they are well aware
20	of what is determined to be discrimination,
21	harassment, retaliation so they're well versed
22	and understand that.
23	And we also provide all of our
24	employees on every level a platform to report
25	any reports of discrimination, harassment,

1	It depends on how long they've been with the
2	organization, but there is continuous training.
3	We do have something that's called
4	core training, that they have to complete as
5	mandatory training, all paid. There's several
6	levels of the training. It depends on their
7	specific role.
8	So for example, for security
9	professionals, there's guidelines of what
10	training they are mandatory to complete.
11	There's also voluntary training
12	available for all of our security professionals
13	through an online platform.
14	There's also site-specific
15	client-requested training that security
16	professionals go through.
17	So it's continuous throughout their
18	employment.
19	Q. And excuse me.
20	I probably asked the question
21	incorrectly.
22	But specific to training on
23	discrimination and retaliation, aside from the
24	new the new employee orientation module, are
25	employees required to take additional training

1	on discrimination and retaliation?
2	A. Yes, if it's State mandated.
3	Q. Okay. So, for example, in Texas are
4	they required to?
5	A. The State does not require it in
6	Texas.
7	Q. Okay. And so if so, Twana Ahmed who
8	was working at Allied, he would have completed
9	the module that you referred to when he was
10	initially hired?
11	A. That is correct.
12	Q. Okay. And so would there be
13	evidence of that completion in the test that
14	was taken somewhere?
15	A. So there is so there's a
16	compliance code that is entered into the
17	compliance tracker in their employee file, that
18	outlines that new employee orientation was
19	completed, and that means that it was
20	successfully completed because there is a final
21	exam at the end.
22	If an employee or new hire at new
23	employer orientation does not pass that exam,
24	we do not move forward with employment for
25	them. So in Mr. Ahmed's situation, he would

1	Q. Was Patrick Freeney disciplined in
2	any way during his time at Allied?
3	A. He was not.
4	Q. Okay. Do you agree that
5	discrimination in the workplace is a
6	foreseeable danger to employees?
7	A. Yes, it is. It could be, yes.
8	Q. Okay. Why is that?
9	A. Well, it depends. If an
10	organization becomes aware of such instance and
11	doesn't act on it, it could escalate between
12	the individuals involved. So it could pose a
13	danger if the company doesn't become involved
14	in the matter.
15	Q. In developing Allied's policies and
16	procedures applicable to preventing
17	discrimination and retaliation in the
18	workplace, did Allied consider any statistics
19	related to, say, the percentage of employees
20	that experience discrimination?
21	A. I do not know.
22	Q. In your experience as an HR
23	professional, have you encountered any studies
24	showing percentages of employees that report
25	having experienced discrimination?

1	A. I do not.
2	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection to
3	outside the scope, Amanda.
4	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
5	Q. In your education and training and
6	experience, are you aware that oftentimes
7	employees that experience discrimination often
8	do not report it out of fear of retaliation?
9	ATTORNEY SHINE: Again,
10	objection. Outside the scope.
11	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
12	Q. You can still answer.
13	ATTORNEY SHINE: To the extent
14	she has any knowledge, she can answer.
15	THE WITNESS: And I'm sorry.
16	Can you rephrase the question?
17	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
18	Q. Sure. At you are an HR
19	professional; correct?
20	A. That is correct.
21	Q. Okay. How long have you been
22	working in HR?
23	A. A little over 10 years.
24	Q. And so in your experience as an HR
25	professional, are you aware that oftentimes

1	employees that experience discrimination will
2	not report it out of fear of retaliation?
3	ATTORNEY SHINE: My objection
4	stands.
5	THE WITNESS: Yes.
6	ATTORNEY SHINE: But she may
7	answer.
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.
9	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
10	Q. Okay. Have you in your studies,
11	have you seen a report noted by the EEOC that
12	roughly 75 percent of employees that have
13	reported workplace conduct have experienced
14	retaliation?
15	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
16	Outside the scope.
17	To the extent she has any personal
18	knowledge, she may answer. However, this is
19	not the appropriate question for a 30(b)(6)
20	witness.
21	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
22	Q. You may answer.
23	A. I do not.
24	Q. How does Allied ensure the
25	discrimination and harassment is not occurring

1	administrative staff.
2	Q. I'm sorry. So that sounded like a
3	manager checking in with its security
4	professionals, but I believe you said that
5	Allied monitors its managers to ensure that
6	they are not engaging in discrimination.
7	How how does Allied monitor its
8	managers to ensure that they are not engaging
9	in discrimination?
10	A. Well, we're just hosting meetings.
11	I mean, it would be very difficult for us to
12	determine whether a manager is behaving in a
13	discriminatory manner unless they fully display
14	that to us.
15	If there was a meeting held or a
16	site visit where a manager fully displayed that
17	they were discriminating against an employee,
18	making an inappropriate comment, it would be
19	addressed immediately.
20	Otherwise, if there's no signs that
21	a manager is, you know, being discriminating
22	against people or having or making
23	inappropriate comments that are not made to us
24	or being reported to us, it'd be difficult for
25	us to determine whether a manager is practicing

1	that without, you know, any reporting of it or
2	visible acts of it.
3	Q. Okay. So aside from, like, meetings
4	that the manager would have with their
5	superiors, there's no other way that Allied can
6	monitor the managers; true?
7	A. That's correct.
8	Q. Okay. Do you agree that
9	discrimination in the workplace is preventable?
10	A. I I mean, that's a difficult
11	question. But, I mean, as much as we would
12	like for it to be prevented, no, I don't think
13	it's 100 percent preventable because we can't
14	control individuals.
15	Q. Okay. Why not?
16	A. Well, you know, we can give all the
17	tools for a manager or individuals to be
18	successful and know, you know, the policies,
19	procedures, laws against preventing these type
20	of discriminatory acts, but as far as an
21	individual, what they when they do that,
22	it's hard for the organization to be able to
23	prevent that because we can't control an
24	individual's acts.
25	What we can do, from a company

1	payroll records. They're responsible for
2	managing that employees are calling in, calling
3	out. Responsible for ensuring that employees
4	are following company guidelines as far as
5	utilizing our technology while they're on post.
6	And interacting with clients and the
7	general public to make sure that our security
8	professionals are meeting company standards and
9	client requirements.
10	Q. Was Patrick Freeney considered the
11	Elite account manager?
12	A. He I don't I wouldn't say that
13	he was the Elite account manager. He oversaw
14	the AGB account, and the Elite program was
15	embedded into that account.
16	Q. And did he oversee that for all of
17	Houston?
18	A. I do not know.
19	Q. Okay. Do you know how many security
20	professionals he managed?
21	A. I do not know.
22	Q. Did Pat did Patrick have
23	authority to hire new members to his team?
24	A. Yes, he did.
25	Q. Did he have authority to discipline

1	members of his team?
2	A. Yes, he did.
3	Q. Did he have authority to approve
4	whether members of the team worked overtime?
5	A. Yes, he did.
6	Q. And I think you said this already,
7	but he had authority to set employee schedules
8	or alter employee schedules?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And did he have authority to fire
11	members of his team?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. It was Patrick Freeney that
14	recommended Twana Ahmed be fired from Allied;
15	true?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. What is your title with Allied?
18	A. Human resources director, regional
19	for the Midwest.
20	Q. And how long have you worked with
21	Allied?
22	A. Eight years.
23	Q. Have you always been the human
24	resources director?
25	A. No.

```
1
     30(b)(6) witness.
 2
                To the extent you have personal
 3
     knowledge and would like to testify to that,
 4
     you may answer.
 5
                      THE WITNESS:
                                    Yes, I do.
                                                 I do
 6
     believe that it is important.
 7
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
                Does Allied require that
 8
          0.
 9
     investigations be conducted immediately when an
10
     employee reports discrimination or harassment?
11
          Α.
                Yes.
12
          0.
                Okay. Do you agree that it would be
13
     wrong to ignore reports of discrimination or
14
     harassment?
15
          Α.
                Yes.
16
                      ATTORNEY SHINE:
                                       Objection.
17
     Outside the scope.
18
                To the extent she has personal
19
     knowledge, she may answer.
20
                      THE WITNESS:
                                     Yes.
21
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
2.2
                Okay. Would it be against Allied's
23
     policies to ignore reports of discrimination or
24
     harassment?
25
          Α.
                Yes.
```

JOB NO. 1171182

1 Do you agree that it would be -- do 2. you agree that it would be reckless to ignore 3 reports of discrimination or harassment? 4 ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection. 5 Outside the scope. 6 To the extent she has personal 7 knowledge, she can answer. 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. 9 BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: 10 I cannot remember if you already 0. 11 answered this, but does Allied have or use any 12 manuals on how to conduct investigations into 13 reports of discrimination? 14 Yes. There are quidelines provided Α. 15 on how to conduct an investigation. 16 Is that, like -- where is Ο. Okav. 17 that housed? Is it housed in an actual manual 18 like a physical book, or is it something 19 online? 20 We are predominantly digital, so it Α. 21 is housed on a company platform under human 22 resources categories, and it outlines and it 23 has -- there's a file that contains all that 24 information. 25 And so is there -- so is there -- is Q.

1	against that individual.
2	Q. Do you have experience spotting red
3	flags of discrimination?
4	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
5	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) witness.
6	To the extent she has personal
7	knowledge, she may testify in an individual
8	capacity.
9	THE WITNESS: I mean, I would
10	say, yes, I would look for patterns, and I
11	would look for if there's anything that sticks
12	out, that needs to be further looked at. Yeah.
13	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
14	Q. Do any come to mind to you right
15	now?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Okay. Could it be a red flag of
18	discrimination if, say, an employee's accent
19	was mocked?
20	A. Yes, that could be.
21	Q. Could it be a red flag of
22	discrimination if an employee was pressured to
23	shave his beard after indicating a religious
24	need to keep the beard?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. Could it be a red flag of
2	discrimination if an employee was pressured to
3	shave his beard, but other employees were not
4	pressured to shave their beard?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. Could it be a red flag of
7	discrimination if an employee was issued a
8	faulty weapon if others were issued working
9	weapons?
10	A. I wouldn't say that was necessarily
11	discrimination.
12	Q. Okay. Could it be a red flag of
13	potential discrimination if an employee was not
14	issued equipment that other employees in the
15	same position were issued?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. Could it be a red flag of
18	discrimination if an employee of a different
19	national origin was told to go back to his
20	country?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. Could cussing at an employee be a
23	red flag of potential discrimination?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Could physical threats toward an

1	employee be a red flag of potential
2	discrimination?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Could racial slurs toward an
5	employee be a red flag of discrimination?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Could a failure to follow policies
8	be a red flag of discrimination?
9	A. I guess I would I think it would
10	need to be a little more specific as to what
11	policies they were failing to follow to see if
12	it's related to discrimination because there
13	are several policies that could not be
14	followed.
15	So I guess it would depend on what
16	policy is not being followed.
17	Q. Okay. In your understanding of
18	employment retaliation, can disciplinary
19	decisions ever be applied in a way that's
20	retaliatory?
21	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
22	Outside the scope of a 30(b)(6) witness.
23	She may answer in an individual
24	capacity to the extent she has knowledge.
25	THE WITNESS: Can you ask the

1	question again?
2	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
3	Q. Sure. In your understanding of
4	employment retaliation, can disciplinary
5	decisions ever be applied in a way that's
6	retaliatory?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. And so under Allied's policies and
9	procedures and training in looking for signs of
10	retaliation, under their procedures, is it
11	is something to look for close timing between a
12	protected activity and the disciplinary action?
13	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
14	Calls for a legal conclusion.
15	To the extent she has personal
16	knowledge, she can answer.
17	THE WITNESS: Yeah. I do not
18	know.
19	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
20	Q. Okay. Do you know what "protected
21	activity" means?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Is that defined in Allied's
24	policies?
25	A. Yes, it is. It's also included in

1 the new employee orientation training. 2 Ο. Okav. And how -- so what is protected activity? What's the definition of 3 4 that protected activity? 5 ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection. 6 Outside the scope. Calls for a legal 7 conclusion. 8 To the extent she has personal 9 knowledge or if you would like to rephrase with 10 respect to Allied's definition of protected 11 activity, she may answer. 12 BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: 13 What is Allied's definition of 14 protected activity provided in the training? 15 Well, Allied -- Allied's definition Α. 16 of it would be -- any protected activity would 17 be any individual that, you know, brings to our 18 attention any religious -- for example, 19 religious accommodation requests. Anything in 20 regards to their sexual orientation, national 21 origin, any protected classes. 2.2 And it would be our, you know, 23 responsibility to ensure that we are protecting 24 those individuals and those classes when they 25 bring any matters to our attention of any type

```
1
     of, you know, activity that is outside the
 2
     policy.
 3
          Q.
                And under those policies, would
 4
     reporting discrimination be a protected
 5
     activity?
 6
          Α.
                Yes.
 7
                Under Allied's policies, would
          Q.
 8
     opposing discrimination be a protected
 9
     activity?
10
                      THE REPORTER:
                                      I'm sorry.
11
     Ma'am --
12
                      ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
13
     sorry. Did you answer?
14
                      THE WITNESS:
                                                I
                                     Yes, yes.
15
     apologize if you guys couldn't hear me.
16
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
17
          Q.
                Excuse me.
                 In the training that's you've
18
19
     received or provided, are you taught to look
20
     for signs of potential retaliation?
21
                                        Objection.
                      ATTORNEY SHINE:
2.2
     Outside the scope of a 30(b)(6) notice.
23
                 If it's directed to her personally
24
     or as a company.
25
                      ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
                                            Let me
```

1	said. He said", "she said. She said," where
2	we weren't able to fully substantiate the
3	allegations due to a lack of evidence, and then
4	subsequently, maybe the reporter then gets
5	removed from a role that affects their pay or
6	their schedule. That would be another example.
7	Q. Okay. Would close timing between
8	the protected activity and then the discipline
9	be a sign of retaliation?
10	A. It would depend on what the
11	discipline would be. Is it a warranted
12	discipline for a violation of policy, or if it
13	wasn't a warranted disciplinary action. It
14	would have to be reviewed.
15	Q. Sorry. Let me rephrase.
16	Could it be a potential sign of
17	retaliation close timing between the protected
18	activity and then the discipline?
19	A. It could be, but it would depend on
20	the circumstances of the discipline.
21	Q. Okay. Could ignoring reports of
22	discrimination be a sign of retaliation?
23	A. Yes.
24	Q. Could physical threats after a
25	protected activity be a sign of retaliation?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. Could visible anger after protected
3	activity be a sign of retaliation?
4	A. Yes.
5	Q. Could threats to fire an employee
6	after protected activity be a sign of
7	retaliation?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Could threat to revoke an employee's
10	security license be a red flag of retaliation?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. Could dispersant treatment be a sign
13	of retaliation?
14	A. Yes.
15	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
16	Calls for a legal conclusion.
17	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
18	Q. For example, if someone was let's
19	say, if one employee was merely suspended for
20	violating a policy yet another employee that
21	engaged in protected activity was fired for
22	violating the same policy, could that be a
23	potential sign of retaliation?
24	A. Can you rephrase the question,
25	please.

1	Q. Sure. If one employee was suspended
2	for violating Allied's policy and another
3	employee was fired for violating the same
4	policy but they had engaged in protected
5	activity, could that be a sign of retaliation?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Could it be a sign of retaliation if
8	an employee's disciplinary form is falsified?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. And could it be a sign of
11	retaliation if a manager lies about having a
12	witness present in a disciplinary meeting?
13	A. Yes.
14	Q. Okay. Thank you.
15	Do you agree that or does Allied
16	agree that all investigations into
17	discrimination or retaliation must be properly
18	documented?
19	A. I'm sorry. Can you ask the question
20	again?
21	Q. Sure. Does Allied agree that all
22	investigations into discrimination or
23	retaliation must be properly documented?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Okay. And Allied has investigation

1	forms that it uses; correct?
2	A. It does have investigation forms,
3	but they're not mandatory to be used. They're
4	provided as a guideline.
5	Q. Okay. Are they considered the best
6	practice?
7	A. Yes.
8	Q. You mentioned earlier a scenario of
9	"He said. She said" or "He said. He said,"
10	what are investigators taught to do if an
11	employee reports one thing, but the manager
12	denies it?
13	A. Well, those are the difficult ones.
14	Right. But we do look for previous patterns.
15	So, for example, if we had a
16	situation where we it was brought to our
17	attention allegation of inappropriate
18	misconduct or inappropriate comments and we
19	there was no witnesses, there's nothing that we
20	could substantiate that the conversation
21	even those conversations occurred,
22	unfortunately, we don't have enough to state
23	that, yes, this act occurred.
24	What we would do is look at any
25	previous if there was any previous complaint

1 that we find through the course of 2 investigation. Right. 3 It's not really black and white when 4 these investigations are occurring. The more 5 questions that we ask, the more patterns that we are looking at, we are able to then possibly 6 7 determine what our next steps are. So it really depends on each 8 9 situation. There's not one -- there's no 10 situations that are all the same, so it really 11 would depend on what we are able to collect, 12 what we are able to find through the course of 13 these investigations. 14 So it's really difficult to say, 15 "Here's what the exact next step we would 16 It would just depend on the information take." 17 we're able to collect. 18 Okay. What is Allied's policy on 19 security professionals having beards? 20 Our policy -- our standard policy is Α. 21 they must be clean shaven. 22 Okay. And if a security Ο. 23 professional must keep a beard for religious 24 purposes, is there an exception? 25 Α. Well, we do ask for a religious

1	accommodation to be completed so we have record
2	of it, but it would be the same thing. They're
3	allowed to keep their beard. It just has to be
4	clean shaven.
5	Q. Can you define "clean shaven"?
6	A. So I believe there's a standard
7	regarding, you know, them making sure it's
8	shaved correctly right above the collar line.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. It's not, like, messy. That it's,
11	you know, well groomed.
12	Q. Okay. So a beard is allowed as long
13	as it's above the collar line and not messy?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. Okay. Are supervisors and managers
16	trained that they should allow beards as long
17	as it's above the collar line and not messy?
18	A. Yes. It's provided in the grooming
19	standards. Yes.
20	Q. Okay. If a security professional
21	tells his supervisor that he needs to keep his
22	beard for religious purposes, what should
23	happen?
24	A. They could ask for a religious
25	accommodation, but it would have something

1	to be reviewed depending on what they're
2	requesting for their beard to be. Are they
3	saying that they can't shave, be clean shaven
4	during this time, the kind of questions we
5	would ask.
6	But they would be allowed to have
7	their beard.
8	Q. Okay. That's probably I probably
9	asked a bad question, but what should the
10	supervisor do if if the security
11	professional is indicating that they want to
12	keep their beard for religious purposes?
13	A. They should be able to allow them as
14	it's not a violation of policy.
15	Q. Okay. So and it's it's
16	against policy for the supervisor to
17	continually pressure the employee to shave
18	after they've expressed that request to keep
19	the beard, right, for religious purposes?
20	A. There wouldn't be an exact policy
21	saying that you can't continue to ask someone
22	that, but no, there would be there shouldn't
23	be a reason why a supervisor is pressuring
24	someone to do so.
25	ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: Okay. If

1	that they felt that the investigation was
2	inadequately completed or we did our own review
3	and found the investigation was inadequately
4	completed, we review what was done what was not
5	done, and determine what level of discipline
6	based on what was not properly conducted during
7	that investigation.
8	So it depends on kind of the
9	circumstances surrounding it.
10	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
11	Q. Can you give me an example of
12	when of an improper investigation?
13	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
14	Outside the scope.
15	To the extent she's answering from
16	her personal knowledge, she may testify.
17	THE WITNESS: Sure. In one of
18	the experiences that I, you know, we've had, we
19	found that a manager didn't respond to a
20	complaint. They received a text message of
21	concerns regarding their supervisors. The
22	manager failed to even respond or act on it.
23	And then it was brought to our
24	attention later that the employee was leaving
25	the organization because they were not they

1	felt that we didn't do any actions to act on
2	their complaint.
3	And the manager was subsequently
4	placed on a final with additional training due
5	to failure to react to a complaint that was
6	brought to their attention.
7	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
8	Q. Okay. But the manager was not
9	terminated?
10	A. No, was not terminated.
11	Q. So you mentioned what under
12	Allied's policies, what are managers supposed
13	to do when somebody reports discrimination?
14	A. Managers are supposed to intake a
15	statement immediately from the reporting party.
16	They're also required to ask all the relevant
17	questions; who was involved, when did it occur,
18	has it happened previously, was this previously
19	reported, are there any witnesses. Asking for,
20	you know, potential areas of where it was. If
21	there's potential camera footage, they may go
22	review it. It just depends if there is or
23	isn't.
24	They are to report it to HR
25	immediately. And we partner with the managers

JOB NO. 1171182

1 to conduct the investigation really depending 2. on what type of allegation it is. 3 Q. Okay. Is Allied's use of force 4 policy mandatory? 5 Α. Yes, it is. 6 Okay. And so the use of force 0. 7 policy allows security professionals to use some force if they fear for their own safety or 8 the safety of others; true? 9 10 It has to be in a very extreme Α. No. 11 So it's not just if they feel that level. 12 there's harm, there has to be deadly threat 13 towards them or others in order for them to 14 engage into any physical activity with someone. 15 But it would have to be a threat of fatality. 16 So it's kind of hard to say yes if 17 that's the, you know, case. It has to be an 18 extreme measure. 19 For any -- are you saying there has Ο. 20 to be a threat of deadly force for any level of 21 the continuum in the use of force policy? 22 That would be the final one. Α. No. 23 There's several levels of the use of force 24 policy. Our security professionals are trained that they should never engage or physically 25

JOB NO. 1171182

touch another individual unless their life 1 2 is -- their life or somebody else's life is 3 being threatened or harmed. 4 Okay. So Allied issues guns to 0. armed security professionals; true? 5 6 Α. Yes. 7 Allied issues guns to armed 0. Okay. security professionals in anticipation that 8 9 there may be some circumstances in which the 10 officer may have to use deadly force; right? 11 It's a deterrent. Α. 12 0. So are the guns -- is a security 13 professional ever justified in using their gun 14 under the use of force policy? As a final, final measure after all 15 Α. 16 other options were exhausted and there's a 17 threat of harm to themselves or another 18 individual, then yes. But it's the final 19 circumstance when all other options were 20 exhausted. 21 Okay. But they are allowed to Ο. 22 use -- so security professionals are allowed to 23 use deadly force if all other avenues were 24 exhausted; right? And there's a threat of immediate 25 Α.

1	harm, yes.
2	Q. And there's a threat of immediate
3	harm. Okay.
4	Would the use of force policy allow
5	a security professional to use deadly force if
6	they were fearful that immediate deadly force
7	would be used on them?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. Okay.
10	A. There would have to be a
11	circumstance that shows whether there was a
12	weapon displayed or predominantly just that
13	there was a weapon displayed and that the
14	individual was, you know, walking towards them
15	to attack them or another individual.
16	Q. Okay. And Allied also issues tasers
17	to officers in anticipation that there may be
18	some circumstances where the officer has to use
19	the TASER; right?
20	A. Yes, but again, that would be the
21	last and final solution to to a scenario.
22	Q. So using a TASER would be would
23	be so let me back up.
24	On the use of force continuum, using
25	deadly force is the final step; right?

1	A. Correct.
2	Q. And that's considered Level 6 force;
3	right?
4	A. Correct.
5	Q. Okay. Using a TASER under the
6	policy, is that considered on the same level as
7	deadly force?
8	A. It would be right above that level.
9	Again, there would have to be a display of some
10	type of weapon or aggression that would
11	that's going to harm someone or themselves for
12	them to be utilizing it.
13	Q. Okay. And so so based on that
14	on the policy, that would be considered Level 6
15	force; right?
16	A. That would be
17	Q. I'm sorry. Level 5 force.
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. 6 is the highest; correct?
20	THE REPORTER: I'm sorry,
21	ma'am. Was that a "yes" or a "no"? You just
22	nodded your head.
23	THE WITNESS: It was a "yes."
24	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
25	Q. So based on the policy, I think you

1	said using a TASER is allowed if the
2	professional fears for his safety or the safety
3	of others and there's been a display of
4	aggression?
5	A. Aggression or a weapon.
6	Q. Or a weapon. Okay. Then the next
7	level below Level 5 is Level 4; right?
8	A. Correct.
9	Q. And so that can involve if the
10	that can involve the use of pepper spray;
11	right?
12	A. I believe so, or detaining at that
13	point, if I'm not mistaken.
14	Q. Detaining? Let me see.
15	A. I would have to refer to the policy
16	to be exact, but I believe
17	Q. Okay.
18	A it would be right above that.
19	Q. Let me see if I can share my screen.
20	Are you able to see
21	A. Yes, I can.
22	Q. It says "Level 4," and this is Bates
23	marked AUS_00115.
24	Do you recognize this as Level 4 of
25	the use of force continuum?

1	A. Yes, yes.
2	Q. Okay. So in looking at this, is
3	Level 4 allowing the use of pepper spray when
4	the officer has a fear for their own safety or
5	the safety of others?
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. Okay. And so does Allied issue
8	pepper spray to its security professionals in
9	anticipation that there may be some
10	circumstances in which they would need to use
11	the pepper spray for their own safety or the
12	safety of others?
13	A. Yes. Extreme measures, yes.
14	Q. Then the next level below that would
15	be Level 3; correct?
16	A. Yes.
17	Q. And so I think this is what you were
18	referring to before where there's it says,
19	"Use of hands, control hold, and restraints";
20	right?
21	A. Yes.
22	Q. And so Allied issues its security
23	professionals handcuffs in anticipation that
24	there may be some circumstances in which they
25	need to use the handcuffs; right?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And under the policy, are security
3	professionals allowed to use handcuffs if they
4	fear for their own safety or the safety of
5	others?
6	A. Yes, but again, I would have to
7	be that has to be somebody posing a real
8	threat to them.
9	But, yes, that's what they would
10	need.
11	Q. Okay. And so under and then
12	below that is Level 2, which is just verbal
13	communication; right?
14	A. Yes. I wouldn't say "just." This
15	is the key one. This is what our security
16	professionals are predominantly trained on as
17	their best efforts is to verbally attempt to
18	de-escalate the situation.
19	They truly at this point, if
20	they're being unsuccessful with de-escalating a
21	situation with an individual, the police should
22	be involved in this matter.
23	All levels higher than this, these
24	are just extreme in a situation where there
25	is there's a threat of harm that poses a

1 situation by providing verbal commands to the 2 individuals and involving the police, as it 3 should be a police matter. If that doesn't 4 work and the police maybe don't arrive in time and the situation is escalating, then they move 5 on to the next levels. 6 7 Q. Okay. Excuse me. I lost my train 8 of thought for a second. 9 These -- these levels allow for some 10 discretion on the part of the professional; 11 correct? 12 Yes. Α. 13 I'm going to stop sharing my screen. Q. 14 Can you give me an example of when 15 it would be okay for the security professional 16 to use their TASER? 17 If an individual displayed a weapon Α. 18 such as a gun or a knife and attempted -- was 19 maybe, like, walking towards them or another 20 individual. 21 Can you give me an example of when a 22 security professional would be allowed to use 23 pepper spray? 24 If an individual was potentially 25 charging at them in an aggressive manner or

1	towards somebody else in an aggressive manner.
2	Q. Okay. And can you give me an
3	example of when the security professional is
4	allowed to use handcuffs?
5	A. If the individual is charging at
6	themselves or another individual in an
7	aggressive manner.
8	Q. So is that that was the same
9	example as Level 4; correct?
10	A. Correct. And that all armed
11	security officers have all means available to
12	them. Some just might have a firearm and
13	handcuffs. Some might just have TASERs and
14	handcuffs. Some might just have OC spray and
15	handcuffs. It depends on the contract. It
16	depends on what the post orders and
17	requirements are.
18	So it's difficult to say that in
19	each scenario, they should use first their
20	handcuffs, then their OC spray, TASER, deadly
21	force, when not all of our armed security
22	officers may have all of those items available
23	to them per the contract requirement.
24	Q. Okay. So assuming they have all of
25	those items available, can you give me an

1	the use of force was justified or unjustified.
2	If there was no immediate harm to any persons
3	involved in the matter, then there wouldn't
4	really be a reason why to use the TASER.
5	Q. Okay. Do all violations of the use
6	of force policy result in termination?
7	A. If they are justified. I mean, I'm
8	sorry. If it's an unjustified use of force.
9	Q. Then if if it's an unjustified
10	use of force, then every security professional
11	is terminated
12	A. Correct.
13	Q at that point? Okay.
14	Do all use do all excuse me.
15	Do all uses of force result in a
16	root cause analysis?
17	A. No.
18	Q. Okay. When is a root cause analysis
19	used?
20	A. First, the situation is evaluated.
21	In situations like a verbal or physical
22	altercation between, for example, two security
23	professionals, a root cause analysis would not
24	be used, but it is considered a use of force.
25	When there is an individual that is

1	engaging with maybe a customer or, for example,
2	engaging with, you know, an unruly a
3	customer and there has been made physical
4	contact to achieve a desired outcome, then a
5	root cause analysis would be conducted.
6	Q. Okay. And does Allied have written
7	policies and procedures on how to conduct a
8	root cause analysis?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. Are those mandatory?
11	A. Yes.
12	Q. What is the purpose of the root
13	cause analysis?
14	A. The purpose of the root cause
15	analysis is to review the circumstances of what
16	transpired in the incident to determine whether
17	or not the use of force was justified or
18	unjustified.
19	Q. Okay. And so if, during the root
20	cause analysis, it's determined that the use of
21	force was justified, then that would that
22	would not result in a termination; correct?
23	A. After review, it would it depends
24	on the circumstances. But if it was considered
25	a justified use of force and if we fully

1	from the security professional that was
2	involved, that doesn't just stop there. We
3	have to do a full investigation into what
4	transpired.
5	Q. Was there any video footage reviewed
6	when Allied conducted Twana Ahmed's root cause
7	analysis?
8	A. From our understanding and review,
9	there was camera footage reviewed on property
10	following the incident.
11	Q. Who reviewed that camera footage?
12	A. Alex Bergeron.
13	Q. Okay. Skipping back to reports of
14	discrimination, who does Allied hold
15	accountable if HR ignores a report of
16	discrimination?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. The question was: Who does Allied
19	hold accountable if HR ignores a report of
20	discrimination?
21	A. The individual that the report was
22	submitted to.
23	Q. Okay. And so how are they held
24	accountable?
25	A. In determining the facts, then they

1	would determine which level of discipline is
2	warranted for that individual and additional
3	training.
4	Q. Okay. But that would not be a
5	termination?
6	A. It's a case-by-case basis. It would
7	determine, you know, how egregious was the
8	complaint, you know, how it was mishandled.
9	You know, is there a history of this.
10	It really depends, you know, if it's
11	a new employee that maybe just didn't know what
12	to do. You know, we put that into perspective.
13	If it's a tenured employee that should have
14	known better, that would play into
15	circumstances.
16	So it would depend on the
17	circumstances surrounding that.
18	Q. Can you clarify what you mean by if
19	it's an egregious complaint?
20	Does that mean that HR is allowed to
21	ignore complaints that are not considered as
22	egregious?
23	A. No.
24	Q. Okay. Should any report of
25	discrimination ever be ignored?

1	A. No.
2	Q. Okay. What date was Twana Ahmed
3	suspended?
4	A. I believe it was April 4, 2022.
5	Q. And when was he terminated?
6	A. The termination date that we have on
7	file is April 4, 2022.
8	Q. What does that mean, "the
9	termination date that we have on file"? Is
10	that the actual termination date?
11	A. It's the it would be his last day
12	worked. I don't know the exact date of when
13	it was maybe processed.
14	But the termination date we have on
15	file for Twana is April 4th.
16	Q. So if Twana's root cause analysis
17	if the root cause analysis was performed for
18	Twana after April 4th, how could he have been
19	terminated before the analysis was performed?
20	A. I do not know.
21	Q. Is it normal procedure for Allied to
22	first conduct the root cause analysis and get
23	approval for that termination before the
24	employee is terminated?
25	A. Yes.

1	Q. Okay. Who has to approve the
2	termination once a root cause analysis is
3	performed?
4	A. Once a root cause analysis is
5	performed, it is the 10-7 document that's
6	completed at the direction of our general
7	counsel, David Buckman.
8	We then it is reviewed by a panel
9	of individuals. The manager overseeing that
10	security professional is the ultimate
11	decision-maker, but it is reviewed to determine
12	whether or not the use of force was justified
13	or unjustified.
14	Based on the determination of the
15	panel review, then the manager makes the final
16	decision on whether termination is warranted
17	based on our findings.
18	Q. The manager makes the final
19	decision. So in this situation in this
20	circumstance would be Patrick Freeney?
21	A. Correct.
22	Q. Under Allied policies, if an
23	employee is suspended for more than one day,
24	then an HR professional must be involved;
25	correct?

1	expectation, but it doesn't necessarily mean
2	that a manager would need to be involved an
3	HR manager, HR director would have to be
4	notified of every suspension in this policy.
5	Q. Okay. So despite the word
6	"required," you're saying this is not
7	mandatory?
8	A. It's a guideline.
9	Q. Okay. Who completed let me stop
10	sharing.
11	Who completed Twana's root cause
12	analysis?
13	A. It would have been Patrick Freeney.
14	And the second reviewer was Felicia
15	Solis-Ramirez. And Bill Keene was also
16	involved in the review. The completion was
17	done by Patrick Freeney.
18	Q. Okay. And you're saying that's
19	normal procedure?
20	A. Correct.
21	Q. Was Patrick Freeney trained in how
22	to conduct root cause analysis analysis?
23	A. He had to work in support of his
24	direct manager Felicia because that was his
25	first incident of a use of force incident.

1	Q. Okay. So the question was: Was
2	Patrick Freeney trained in how to conduct root
3	cause analysis?
4	A. I'm sorry. I do not know.
5	Q. Okay. I want to ask about the
6	just in general general background on some of
7	the supervisors for Twana.
8	I believe you mentioned Alex
9	Bergeron. I is that how you pronounce his
10	last name?
11	A. I believe so, yes.
12	Q. Alex Bergeron, when was he first
13	hired with Allied?
14	A. I do not recall the exact dates. We
15	have records I can refer back to. I can get
16	exact dates, but I do not recall at this time.
17	Q. Would you be able to refer to it
18	right now?
19	A. I would have to log into our systems
20	to review it, yeah.
21	Q. Okay. Does Alex Bergeron still work
22	for Allied?
23	A. Yes, he does.
24	Q. What is his title?
25	A. His current title is an armed

```
exact number of individuals she would have --
 1
 2
     she would have directly been involved with, but
 3
     it would have been the branch staff.
                                             We could
 4
     definitely find that information out, as well,
 5
     though.
 6
                Did Patrick Freeney submit the
          Ο.
 7
     hotline report?
 8
          Α.
                No.
 9
                Who submitted the report?
          Ο.
10
          Α.
                It was another individual in the
11
     branch.
              I believe her name was Savannah.
12
                        What was the date of that
          0.
                Okav.
     investigation?
13
14
          Α.
                I do not recall.
15
          0.
                Okay.
                        I'm not sure if I asked this
16
     before, but was Catherine Barnes the subject of
17
     an investigation while during -- has she been
18
     the subject of an investigation while at
19
     Allied?
20
          Α.
                I do not believe so, no.
21
                Has she been issued any discipline?
          Ο.
22
                I do not know.
          Α.
23
                Was Catherine Barnes disciplined in
          Ο.
24
     any way when she ignored Twana Ahmed's report
     of discrimination?
25
```

1	A. I do not know.
2	Q. Would you be able to find out?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. Could you find out right now?
5	A. I would have to get in contact with
6	the Houston branch to do that.
7	Q. Okay. When a report of
8	discrimination is ignored, what could happen to
9	the employee?
10	A. I believe we covered this a little
11	bit earlier, but it really depends on the
12	circumstances, what transpired, and you know,
13	it depends on the tenure of the individual as
14	well.
15	But there should be either a
16	coaching session or guidance provided,
17	retraining to an individual that has ignored
18	it. It really would depend on the manager's
19	decision on that, but there should be some
20	level of coaching and above to an individual
21	that ignored a complaint.
22	Q. So let me rephrase the question. I
23	did not ask it in a great way.
24	When a report of discrimination is
25	ignored, what could happen to the employee

```
1
     that's reporting?
 2
                     ATTORNEY SHINE:
                                       Objection.
 3
     Calls for speculation. Outside the scope of
 4
     the 30(b)(6).
 5
                To the extent she has personal
 6
     knowledge, she may answer.
 7
                     THE WITNESS:
                                    I quess I don't
 8
     understand the question, and I quess I don't
 9
     know.
10
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
11
                What's the danger in ignoring
          0.
12
     reports of discrimination to the employees that
13
     are reporting?
14
                     ATTORNEY SHINE:
                                       Same
15
     objection.
16
                     THE WITNESS: You know, in my
17
     experience, you know, obviously, there -- there
18
     is a concern if there's -- obviously, if
19
     there's not action taken immediately to
20
     investigate, because it is our standard to
21
     immediately investigate concerns as they're
2.2
     brought to our attention. If somebody does
23
     fail to act or escalate a concern that was
24
     brought their attention, it is our -- you know,
25
     from my experience, it is to either coach or
```

1	discipline, depending, you know, case by case,
2	determining what level is warranted in that
3	situation.
4	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
5	Q. Could it create an unsafe working
6	condition for the employee for the
7	reporter
8	ATTORNEY SHINE: Same
9	objection.
10	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
11	Q if the report is ignored?
12	A. Okay. Can you rephrase the
13	beginning of that question?
14	Q. Sure. Could ignoring the report of
15	discrimination create an unsafe working
16	environment for the reporter?
17	ATTORNEY SHINE: Same
18	objection.
19	THE WITNESS: I mean, in my
20	experience, it could.
21	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
22	Q. Could it lead to continued
23	harassment?
24	ATTORNEY SHINE: Same
25	objection.

1	THE WITNESS: In my
2	experience, it could.
3	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
4	Q. Could it lead to unfair discipline?
5	ATTORNEY SHINE: Same
6	objection.
7	THE WITNESS: In my
8	experience, it could.
9	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
10	Q. Do you understand what I mean when I
11	say the "N word"?
12	A. Yes, I do.
13	Q. Do you agree that the N word is a
14	racial slur?
15	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
16	Calls for a legal conclusion. Outside the
17	scope of the 30(b)(6) witness.
18	To the extent she has any personal
19	knowledge, she may testify.
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
21	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
22	Q. Under Allied's policies, is the N
23	word considered a racial slur?
24	A. Yes, it is.
25	Q. Is it against Allied's policies to

1	use the N word in the workplace?
2	A. Yes, it is.
3	Q. Is it against Allied's policies for
4	managers to call workers a "sand N word"?
5	A. Yes, it is.
6	Q. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 being
7	not harmful at all and 10 being extremely
8	harmful, how harmful is it to call someone a
9	sand N word?
10	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
11	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) notice.
12	To the extent she has personal
13	knowledge or experience, she may testify.
14	THE WITNESS: In my
15	experience, yes. I mean, sorry. I apologize.
16	ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: Thank
17	you. I'm just going to take a couple minutes
18	to look over my notes, but I think I'm about
19	ready to wrap up.
20	Take five minutes.
21	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now
22	off the record. The time is 11:21 a.m. Central
23	Time.
24	(A recess was taken.)
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are now

```
1
     on the record. The time is 11:24 a.m. Central
 2
     Time.
 3
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
 4
                        Just a few follow-up
          Ο.
                Okav.
 5
     questions on records.
 6
                How does Allied ensure that employee
 7
     notices of counseling are not backdated?
 8
                I would not know.
          Α.
 9
                Are is there any policy that
          0.
10
     requires that the notices of counseling be
11
     logged into a system somewhere or digitally
12
     prepared?
13
                They are -- they could be digitally
14
     prepared or handwritten.
                                There is no direction
15
     in which they should do it in.
16
                Once a disciplinary record is
17
     completed, we should be logging it into our
18
     NAVEX system for recordkeeping.
19
          Q.
                Okay.
20
                      THE REPORTER:
                                      I'm sorry.
21
     What's that system called?
2.2
                      THE WITNESS:
                                    NAVEX.
23
                                     Thank you.
                      THE REPORTER:
24
     BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
25
                So once a -- once a disciplinary
          Ο.
```

1	form is issued, it should be logged in that
2	same day that it's given?
3	A. It doesn't necessarily need to be
4	logged in that same day, but it should be
5	logged in as quickly as possible.
6	Q. Okay. So then there's no there's
7	no way that Allied can ensure that the notices
8	are not backdated; true?
9	A. We would trust that our managers are
10	putting the correct dates on there.
11	Q. Okay. But I don't think that
12	answered the question. There's no way that
13	Allied can ensure that the notices of
14	counseling are not backdated; true?
15	A. True.
16	Q. Okay. How does Allied ensure that
17	an employee is actually given the counseling?
18	A. On the bottom portion of the of
19	the disciplinary notice, there's a section for
20	signatures where it requires the employee to
21	sign or the individual receiving the
22	discipline.
23	If they refuse to sign it, we would
24	write on the line that they refused to sign.
25	Q. And so if the manager wrote down,

1	"Refused to sign," there's no way for Allied to
2	know that the employee actually received the
3	notice; correct?
4	A. It would be based on the information
5	located at the bottom of the disciplinary
6	notice. That's how we would be confirming it.
7	Q. I'm sorry. I don't think that
8	answered the question.
9	But if if the manager is the one
10	that writes down "Refused to sign" but doesn't
11	actually give the employee the notice, there's
12	no way for Allied to know whether the employee
13	actually got the notice; true?
14	A. Correct.
15	Q. Does Allied, as part of its
16	policies, require there to be a witness when an
17	employee is counseled?
18	A. Yes.
19	Q. Okay. So is a witness to the
20	counseling one way that Allied can ensure that
21	the counseling actually happened?
22	A. Yes.
23	Q. Okay. And so if if there's if
24	there isn't a witness, is that against Allied's
25	policies?

1	A. No, not necessarily. No.
2	Q. Okay. So sorry. Going back, I
3	believe you just testified that it that a
4	witness is required when an employee is given a
5	notice of counseling.
6	A. Yes. On the bottom of the form, we
7	do have space that to provide where the
8	employee that's receiving the disciplinary, the
9	manager that's issuing, and then a witness
10	that's part of the that's in the room
11	witnessing the counseling or termination
12	transpiring should sign it, as well.
13	Q. Okay. Thank you.
14	If it's determined that a witness's
15	signature was falsified, is that a potential
16	red flag of retaliation?
17	A. If a witness signature is falsified?
18	Q. Yes.
19	A. No, no.
20	Q. Would that be a red flag at all to
21	you
22	A. It would be a red flag, yes.
23	Q. What would it be a red flag of?
24	A. Improper recordkeeping.
25	Q. So if a manager wanted to retaliate

1	against retaliate against an employee by
2	creating a paper trail of concerns and forging
3	witness signatures, would that be a red flag to
4	you of potential retaliation?
5	ATTORNEY SHINE: Objection.
6	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) witness.
7	To the extent you're asking for her
8	personal knowledge or opinion, she can answer.
9	THE WITNESS: Yeah. And in my
10	personal opinion, yes, that would.
11	BY ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ:
12	Q. Okay. Is it against Allied's
13	policies for somebody to fake signatures on
14	counseling forms?
15	A. I'm sorry. Can you reask the
16	question?
17	Q. Is it against Allied's policy for a
18	manager to fake signatures of witnesses on
19	counseling forms?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Is it against Allied's policies for
22	a manager to backdate counseling forms?
23	A. I guess I would have to understand
24	what the backdate would be. Is it backdating
25	to not the date of the actual meeting? I would

1	just need to get clarity on that question.
2	Q. Right. Fair enough. <mark>Is it</mark>
3	against's Allied's policy to for managers to
4	create counseling forms that were never
5	actually given?
6	A. Yes.
7	ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: Okay.
8	Pass the witness.
9	ATTORNEY SHINE: I have no
10	questions.
11	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay.
12	Ms. Repsik, would you like to confirm
13	transcript orders first?
14	THE REPORTER: Yes.
15	Mr. Shine, do you need a copy of the
16	transcript?
17	ATTORNEY SHINE: Yes, please.
18	THE REPORTER: Does anyone
19	need a rough draft?
20	ATTORNEY SHINE: No.
21	ATTORNEY HERNANDEZ: No
22	thanks.
23	THE REPORTER: All right.
24	Thank you.
25	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. And